

way you please and let them run up and down hills or in and out among trees in the forest, and have their weapons and be taught, don't shoot at the wrong target, that is not prohibited. But let's say a law enforcement officer says that because of the way these individuals are attired or because of opinions I have heard them express, Senator Chizek described the hate groups as those who teach hatred of the government, of certain religious and racial groups. So a law enforcement has heard those ideas and attitudes expressed by members of this group and some of the members very well could be members of the Legislature because from things that go around, those attitudes are entertained by some members of the Legislature. So, that would put this law enforcement officer in a position to say that because these people are attired a certain way, I think they are in violation of the law, and all these people have to say is that we are teaching the safe handling and use of firearms, and they are out from under the province of this law. If Senators Chizek, Beutler and Hoagland say, well, that should take away the opposition that I, Senator Chambers, would have to the bill because it can't be enforced on anybody, then it shows you what a worthless, nonsensical, meaningless piece of legislation it is that is being foisted on the Legislature. But, remember, contrary to what a reporter, in the World Herald, wrote because she misunderstood the bill and consequently misstated the terms of the bill, this teaching that occurs is not for the purpose of causing a civil disorder. The training is not for the purpose of causing a disorder. The bill doesn't require that at all. It simply says that the teaching could be used by somebody and the teacher knows, or ought to know, that these somebodies will so use the teaching, or that the teacher intends it for that purpose. But it does not say the teacher is inciting. Senator Beutler and other lawyers, if they don't know, ought to know because of their training in law school, which they successfully completed, that there are certain types of speech which the Supreme Court and other courts have deemed protected by the Constitution and those types of speech cannot be infringed by the state. But there are other types of speech that have been deemed outside of the protection of the first amendment. And I went through and did a little checking to get some of those types of speech and here are some of the types that courts have said are not protected. And, by the way, this teaching that is involved in this law which is made a Class IV felony, does not fit in any of these nonprotected